

4/3/77

Dear Mo,

I write briefly about what I would not discuss by phone yesterday. It is not paranoia about the phone. I have had dependable reports of the volumes of the transcripts of conversations. As I told you not too long ago they goofed, I caught them and the phone company came unglued. They were doing some work on a direct tap at the automated switchboard and there was a dead short on the line for a while. From as good a source as there can be I am told it could be nothing else.

Reaction to my first effort on the JFK assassination is what has determined all I have done since the. Immediately relevant is the lead and summary that cost me my agent. First sentence, "Lee Harvey Oswald could not have been persona non grata to the FBI."

There is another such understatement in Whiteash The First, that only the establishing of what in intelligence is called a cover explains Oswald's New Orleans career.

This is to say that from the very first I have been working on the book Agent Oswald. I have had more than enough for it for five or more years. I submitted the draft of about a half-dozen chapters to Bantam then, with the results I mentioned the other night. The editors like it and Jaffe would not touch it. Most of my New Orleans work was tracing this as best one without funds or local sources could trace it. By and large the results are good. What I have is extraordinarily exciting.

We can discuss details in persona any time you want to. Maybe if Jim can deliver this, assuming he comes today and you are still in D.C., he'll tell you a bit more. But one of the reasons for my vigorous and extremely costly efforts to get all the executive session transcripts is the pursuit of relevant evidence. I've interviewed Henry Wade, Dean Storey, Guy Johnson, the late Alan Sweatt and many others on this. Plus one interview with a little-known FBI agent.

Dulles wanted the first deliberations on this point, Oswald as agent, destroyed. It was agreed to. I have the Secret Service receipt for the destruction of all places in the White House! I have also retrieved the one record that escaped this memory hole. I have the CIA record of Dulles' guidance of it around that hairy one. I have, among a large number of interrelated items on this altered testimony to avoid the agency, enough to jail Bringuier on perjury charges. I located and interviewed the then kid who met the real Oswald at Bringuier's. He refused to talk to Garrison. I turned his parents on first, then his father was killed mysteriously and then his lawyer became my ally. The interview with him, on tape, was in her home, not her office. He was kidnapped the night Ferrie died, by the guy who recruited Oswald into the CAP. I have the suppressed CAP records, including on Ferrie. One simplification: Oswald became a provocateur as soon as he got to New Orleans. I have the late Douglas Jones on tape in Oswald not being the one who had that literature printed. I can go on and on with details. This fragment is as it comes to mind after all these years.

Now let me jump ahead to the Sr. P.S. letter I read you yesterday, with an introduction from that eminent expert Martin Waldron, "You are not naive - you trust people too much." True. Most of my relatively few mistakes come from this. So I made the mistake of trusting the FBI when it said the writing was not LHO's.

However, I have also learned that the FBI's lies are always significant. They rarely lie completely. They always prefer semantics. I made a major breakthrough in the King case from an accurate analysis of the reasons for a lie it required considerable factual knowledge to be able to analyze.

Again in simplification, these lies are always because the alternative is less to its interest as the FBI perceives its interest.

Friday I told you I was confident Oswald was working for the FBI when he returned

from the USSR. My belief is that Fain intimidated him into this in Fort Worth. I told you it was not new that Oswald had written Hosty, that Marina and Ruth Paine both testified to it and were ignored. I told you it was not new that Hosty had destroyed all his records. This is in my published writing. It was not until a month after the assassination and the Commission and the FBI knew it. Sources: Oswald in New Orleans.

It is a mistake to believe that Hosty was investigating Oswald. He was leaning on him. He was defaming Marina, not "accosting" her. He was staying away from Oswald in person, so far as we know. We do know that he knew Oswald was at the TSBD and that he never went there for him. Bear on this I have a fascinating bit about the FBI's withholding those pages of his addressbook from the Commission and its non-explanation, all in documents. Whether or not he'll tell the truth I can lead you to a resigned FBI agent ^{who} ~~that~~ claims to have been told much by Hosty with whom he worked.

I'm not going into all that relates to the date of the Hunt letter, 11/8, but it is a significant date. It is immediately after one of Hosty's pressures on Marina and it coincides with the weekend on which Oswald wrote the Russian embassy in Washington. Ruth Paine saw this letter and reported it to the FBI. She reported much to the FBI. Digression: Michael could not pass a security test, family Trotskyites. I have the records on this, too. Broad inference one was an FBI informant, as I recall in Los Angeles.

I told you this is a Byzantine situation. With Oswald the accused assassin if he had CIA contacts in Russia and FBI contacts in the U.S., what could be more Byzantine? What could have each agency at the throat of the other? I even have a record of how Hoover personally tried to set the CIA up on precisely this point and evidence of how Helms worked around that. The CIA is still fighting me in court on one of the missing links.

Now let us consider who could have had a copy of a real letter the real Oswald wrote to a real person? Oswald's records hold no carbon copies. Besides, this is not a carbon. It could be an original he did not mail but I'm inclined to discount that. It almost certainly has to have been in the possession of someone who obtained it in the course of official duties or from one who received it from such a person.

We can discard H.E. Hunt, obviously. It is probable that E. Howard can also be discarded although he had a past of Cuban involvement. The reason is little known: he found the CIA's policies too liberal, asked to be relieved, was relieved, and at the time of this letter was working for Dulles in headquarters, as I recall, probably helping prepare The Craft of Intelligence. So what remains?

Another person named Hunt or one using the name Hunt.

In using aliases, and federal agents have been known to, it is common to select a name easily recalled and usually beginning with the same letter. Hunt and Hosty both begin with H. Hosty's politics were those of H.L. Hunt, which made recall easier.

The non-story of Oswald writing Hosty was leaked only after Gordon Shanklin's retirement was secure. If I were to make a guess about by whom it would be an old pal of yours who you knew to have what most reporters do not have, two "Lincoln Continentals." I have other reasons for believe he was CIA, including his colleague in it and details of some of their ~~exploits~~ exploits. Hugh earned his money. Whether or not relevant he departed from the role of reporter and worked in Shaw's defense. Shaw had been CIA, in my belief not in any sinister capacity. I wrote this in Oswald in New Orleans, long before the CIA confirmed it. I knew of its efforts and interest in his defense from Marchetti.

I'll have to think about this more but the most reasonable explanation of this letter is that it is the one not destroyed. The story of the destruction is a new one. I do not believe Hosty would have perjured himself unnecessarily before the Warren Commission. He could as easily have testified that in common with other agents he destroyed his notes and other records once they were typed up.

Why was Hosty disciplined? Jack Revill's report of their brief conversation was

made immediately, sworn to and withheld by Curry on Shanklin's request. Whether or not completely accurate, and I think it is not, it was no basis for disciplining Hosty and it ran an FBI risk if Hosty got angry over an unjustified disciplining.

Why would Marina do anything the Secret Service asked and refuse to see Hosty or anyone else in the FBI until they really leaned on her-threatened deportation on the one hand and promised citizenship and riches on the other? For that matter why would the Secret Service, with the Marina prize firmly and exclusively in hand, turn it over to the FBI?

Did you know that before the assassination the FBI quited the White Russian's fears about Oswald, even gave him credentials with them? Through Mellor, I have this from Texas records. Can you think of anything more atypical of the FBI and "reds?"

Philbrick was Oswald's boyhood idol. I have this part written. Oswald began playing Philbrick when he was about 16, maybe younger. Politically Oswald was anti-Communist. He was an Orwellian. For a moment Liebelier lost himself on this in questioning Diego Delgado. It is Liebelier who altered the New Orleans transcript to give the Commission a false quote on Oswald's career there. It is Liebelier who also handled the McChann, actually Machann matter. I found the self-defrocked father and interviewed him on tape. He confirmed to me that what Odio told him he had to regard as given in confessional. He was never a Commission witness. The Secret Service trusted nobody under Tom Kelley to interview him. Assistant Director Kelley, then Inspector. The same man to whom Oswald said he'd talk once he had a lawyer. Five minutes before he was killed. Oswald was top-secret and crypto cleared in the Marines who, e he was getting Communist literature through the mails. While his fraudulent discharge, for which he was never prosecuted, was being processed he worked in the base security office. How "red" can you be in the Marines?

There is much more, wonderful detail, a book in which I ~~already~~ have excited interest. The problem is I can't do all I should do. This is why I offered to share what I think you would enjoy doing and what will be profitable to you if you could arrange the work security and help I need so I can do more and be more effecient. I do think those you know now have a real interest in ending these persisting allegations about them. Whether or not the CIA started them, and I can make out a case that it did, when I detected them in the manuscript of Farewell America I delivered this to Paul Rothermel for old man Hunt, who thanked me for it, remembering it when he appeared to be getting senile, in December 1972 as I now recall. Farewell America was a SDECE operation. It is the French CIA. I gave the typescript to Paul just after the 1968 election. I also obtained and gave him all the available records relating to the Hunts. We've been friends since.

In connection with all the disconnected foregoing, ask yourself why the agencies are helping with the Epstein project of the book that will say the KGB killed JFK through Oswald? John Barron supervising it for Readers Digest, advance \$500,000? Why not earlier?

If you want I'll introduce you to the publisher. He has been here and knows that when I say I have a record I have that record. e brought his house counsel, whose mind blew at the records he saw.

Hastily,